

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of January 10, 2006. With this response, claims 1, 36 and 37 have been amended and claims 1-55 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

Additionally, Applicant notes that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 19, 2006 was not acknowledged by the Examiner. With this response, a copy of that Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith along with a copy of the stamped returned postcard indicating receipt by the U.S. Patent Office. Consideration and entry of the Information Disclosure Statement and references are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, all independent claims 1, 36 and 37 were rejected based upon Eryurek (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,143) in view of Sederlund et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,301). However, Applicant believes that these references do not show or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, Eryurek was cited as showing a safety response module. The specific language of Eryurek was at column 6, lines 21-42 and column 41, lines 44-64. However, Eryurek merely provides an output and is not a response in the context of the present invention.

Specifically, with the present invention when a safety event is identified, a safety response output is provided. The response can be compensating for the safety event, controlling current in the process control loop, providing an alarm, etc. In contrast, Eryurek simply provides a failure event output and does not actually perform any function in response to the failure event. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn. The independent claims have been amended to emphasize this distinction.

Additionally, the Eryurek reference relates to detecting errors in a process control system. There is no indication that its teachings would be applicable to a Safety Integrity Level (SIL) System. Similarly, there are no teachings within the Sederlund et al. reference that one should look to the Eryurek (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,143) reference.

Additionally, it is believed that the dependent claims, when read in the proper context with the independent claims, are not shown or suggested by the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is believed that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:rev